

EXHIBIT 69

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
Plaintiff)
)
vs.) No. 1-19-CR-10080
)
GAMAL ABDELAZIZ and JOHN)
WILSON,)
Defendants.)
)
)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE NATHANIEL M. GORTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
JURY TRIAL - DAY 8

John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse
Courtroom No. 4
One Courthouse Way
Boston, Massachusetts 02210

September 20, 2021
9:15 a.m.

Kristin M. Kelley, RPR, CRR
Debra Joyce, RMR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse
One Courthouse Way, Room 3209
Boston, Massachusetts 02210
E-mail: kmob929@gmail.com

Mechanical Steno - Computer-Aided Transcript

1 A. Gamal did.

2 MS. KEARNEY: And if we can go to Exhibit 459 in
3 evidence.

4 Blow up the top message there, please.

5 Q. Ms. Sanford, who reminded you as to Rick's direction about
6 the essays, that it needed to include basketball?

7 A. Gamal did.

8 MS. KEARNEY: Can we pull up Exhibit 681 in evidence,
9 please.

12:38 10 Can we go to page 2.

11 And that section on substantial assistance motion.

12 Q. You were asked some questions on cross-examination about
13 the favorable recommendation from the government?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And I think Mr. Kelly pointed out to you that the first
16 sentence of that second paragraph, "the determination whether
17 defendant has provided substantial assistance rests solely in
18 the discretion of the U.S. Attorney."

19 A. Yes.

12:39 20 Q. Can you read the second sentence, please?

21 A. "The U.S. Attorney will make this determination based on
22 the truthfulness and value of the defendant's assistance,
23 regardless of the outcome or result of any proceeding or
24 trial."

25 Q. You were asked some questions about whether Mr. Singer

1 Q. Why not?

2 A. We believe we had the information that we need from the
3 coach. If we thought we didn't have enough information, we
4 would ask our Athletic liaison to get us more specific
5 information, but in these cases, it looks like we had all the
6 information that we needed to make an admissions decision.

7 Q. Based on your experience in USC admissions, what's the
8 likelihood that these applicants would have been committed if
9 they weren't walk-on athletes?

03:02 10 MR. SHEKETOFF: Objection.

11 THE COURT: Overruled.

12 A. It's highly unlikely. I don't think any of them would be
13 admitted without their athletic talent.

14 Q. Did Donna Heinel tell you that the parents of these
15 students were making payments in connection with their
16 admission?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Did you know that payments were contingent on their
19 admission?

03:02 20 A. Absolutely not.

21 Q. Would that information have mattered to you in evaluating
22 these students?

23 A. Absolutely. That would have been a huge problem.

24 Q. Why?

25 A. Because we don't offer admission in exchange for money.

1 C E R T I F I C A T E
2
34 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT)
5 DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS)
6
78 We, Kristin M. Kelley and Debra Joyce, certify that
9 the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of
10 proceedings taken September 15, 2021 in the above-entitled
11 matter to the best of our skill and ability.
12
1314 /s/ Kristin M. KelleySeptember 20, 202115 /s/ Debra JoyceSeptember 20, 202116 Kristin M. Kelley, RPR, CRR
17 Debra Joyce, RMR, CRR
18 Official Court Reporter
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Date